

REMARKS

To simplify prosecution and accelerate allowance, system claims 1-3 and 15-19 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The amendment obviates the rejection of claims 1-3 raised under 35 U.S.C. 101. However, the applicant disputes the position that the claimed subject matter is non-statutory, and reserves the right to pursue claims of the same or a similar scope in one or more continuing applications. Similarly, claim 9 has been canceled and its features have been incorporated into claim 8; however, the applicant reserves the right to pursue a claim of the same or similar scope to claim 8, or on any other subject matter described in the patent specification, in one or more continuing applications.

The application now includes claims 8, 10, 14, and 20-23.

Claims 1-3, 8-10, and 14-23 were rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0018719 to Ruths in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0167344 to Danso. This rejection is traversed.

In the office action, the Examiner takes the position that paragraph 85 of Ruths shows a user control that enables a user to create a collaboration space. This is not precisely correct, and it is noted that claim 8 requires

enabling a user

to create a collaboration space,

to associate the collaboration space with a context, and

to perform at least one of adding, editing, and deleting a collaboration member in the collaboration space, said collaboration space containing at least one of a role player and a discussion thread; (emphasis added).

With reference to paragraph [0085] of Ruths it can be seen that a collaborative resource, e.g., spreadsheet data, can be used simultaneously by three different users using three different "views", i.e., a person could use the data on his desk top in connection with a database, another person could use the data on his desk top with a spread sheet

application, and a third person could use the data on a PDA using a native spread sheet paragraph. Thus, what is shown in paragraph [0085] is a collaborative environment where, for example, three different people can use data in three different ways using three different views.

In contrast, the invention, the claimed invention is a methodology is focused on supporting collaborative development among a team of developers. In the method, a user can create the collaboration space, associate the space with a context, and perform at least one of adding, editing, and deleting a collaboration member in the collaboration space. With reference page 9 of the application, at lines 15 et seq., it can be seen that the arrangement allows the user to associated contexts in a hierarchical or parent/child manner, and to add/edit/delete members and assign a specific role to each for the CollabSpace. Thus, the claimed method is permitting the user to control how the collaboration proceeds in the collaboration space. Ruths provides no mechanism whatsoever for this. Further, Danso does not address this (it being noted that Danso is being relied upon for its showing of discussions and forums, and has no showing of a user being able control a collaboration space in a manner similar to claim 8.

Claim 8 also requires

allowing a first user to communicate with one or more other users and to gain access to resources in the context said first user is working in without said first user having to leave said first user's development environment and without said first user having to switch to a different collaboration application (emphasis added)

The Examiner has relied upon Ruths as showing a similar feature in paragraph [0056]. However, this is simply incorrect. Paragraph [0056] pertains to the collaborative platform 16 interacting with remote collaborative resources, and allowing a user to view collaborative resources on a display 13. Wholly lacking is the first user communicating with other users and gaining access to resources in the context said first user is working without said first user having to leave said first user's development environment and without said first user having to switch to a different collaboration application. Ruths

appears to do exactly the opposite, and requires a user outside of a context to view other resources and go to them outside his development environment when he will work on a different application.

In view of the above, claims 8, 10, 14, and 20-23 are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date is requested.

Applicants hereby make a written conditional petition for extension of time, if required. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Applicants' Deposit Account No. 50-0510 (IBM Corporation).

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael E. Whitham', written in a cursive style.

Michael E. Whitham
Registration No. 32,635

Whitham, Curtis Christofferson & Cook, P.C.
11491 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 340
Reston, Virginia 20190
Tel. (703) 787-9400
Fax. (703) 787-7557